DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 853 IR 009 430

AUTHOR Kotzer, Donna
TITLE The 1980 User Study of the Metropolitan Toronto Library.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 26p.: For related documents, see IR 009 434-435.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Library Facilities; Library Materials; Library Research; Library Surveys; *Participant Characteristics; *Public Libraries; Questionnaires; Tables (Data); *User Satisfaction (Information); Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Library Users; Toronto Public Library (Canada)

ABSTRACT

Conducted to furnish data which would profile users of the Metropolitan Toronto Library, this 1980 survey drew its findings from a sample of 884 questionnaires (randomly selected from the 5,304 returned) which were distributed to entering and exiting library patrons over a 3-day period. The survey found that 62 percent of the respondents were students and that 19 percent were professionals. The most frequented departments were science and technology, social sciences, business, history, and languages. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents used books, and 57 percent specified that they found the materials they were seeking. Seventy-six percent of respondents who asked for assistance were satisfied with the help they received. Tables present a complete breakdown of the data gathered. Coding instructions and a copy of the questionnaire are provided. (FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203853

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE 1980 USER STUDY

OF THE

METROPOLITAN TORONTO LIBRARY

by

Donna Kotzer

This report has been prepared for the Metropolitan Toronto Library Board, under the supervision of Margery Allen, Head, Metropolitan Toronto Library, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for course LIB 2005 Directed Field Work - Public Libraries: Administrative Practice, Professor: L. G. Denis.

University of Toronto
Faculty of Library Science
April 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donna Kotzer
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR009430

The 1980 User Study of the Metropolitan Toronto Library is the second survey which has been conducted by a student from the Faculty of Library Science of the University of Toronto. The survey took place on Thursday, April 17, Saturday, April 19, and Sunday, April 20, 1980. The first survey had been taken on the same days of the week, on April 19, 21, and 22, 1979. The 1979 questionnaire was adapted from the model outlined in *A Data gathering and instruction manual for performance measures in public libraries* by Ellen Altman, Ernest R. DeProspo, Philip M. Clark, and Ellen Connor Clark. The 1980 questionnaire was further modified following a meeting between the author, Professor Denis, the Head of the Library, and various department heads. (See Appendix I) A pre-test was held on Tuesday, April 15 from 5.30 p.m. to 9 p.m. Careful attention was given to the responses to the new questions. It was found that the questionnaire was adequate, and so it was used without further change. Two part-time staff were stationed at the "library" entrance, two at the exit. Users of the first floor Newspaper Unit were not handed a questionnaire unless they had a reason to come through the "library" entrance. (This should be taken into consideration when one examines the statistics indicating how many users were in the first floor newspaper area.) The procedure for carrying out the survey was basically the same as last year. As noted in the 1979 report, refusals at the entrance increased on the second and third day as users refused to fill out a form they had already responded to the previous day. The author found that several users who had participated in the pre-test also refused to take a questionnaire on the actual testing day(s). Therefore, if a week-long survey had been conducted in order to get a more representative sample of the population, the refusal rate would increase accordingly. Another problem encountered (one which was not reported on last year) was the large number of users who wandered in and out of the Library several times during the day for various reasons, such as lunch, coffee, fresh air, etc. If a person walked out and then re-entered the Library, he would be asked to take a questionnaire. A refusal (even if the user had previously filled out a questionnaire) would be included on the list of non-takers. Ideally, whenever a user walks through the entrance, he is coming for a specific reason. This was not the case for many of the "take-five" users. Therefore the rate of refusal is somewhat misleading (500 on Thursday, 747 on Saturday, and 158 on Sunday) if one does not take into consideration that approximately 30-40% of the refusals represent users who refused to fill out another questionnaire.

Questionnaires that were taken, filled out, but not returned were picked up during the day and at closing time. These questionnaires were coded as a 'no response' when it came time to deal with the duration of the stay in the Library. Also included in this batch were questionnaires that were inadvertently taken home by the user and brought back the next day. In order to determine how long people stayed in the Library, at each half-hour a paper with the time on it was placed in the deposit box. The part-time staff asked users to return their answered questionnaires. If a user did not fill out a questionnaire, he was "reminded" to do so before he went

through the exit gate. The average rate of return was 70%; this is approximately a 7% rise in returns from the year before. An improved return rate does not necessarily reflect a more conscientious user group, but rather the extra effort made to gather "orphan" questionnaires and encourage "forgetful" users to fill out the form at the exit. The number of questionnaires answered and returned was:

	1979	1980
Thursday	1,885	2,016
Saturday	2,084	2,076
Sunday	1,100	1,212
	5,069	5,304

At the request of the Library, the sampling population was increased. The 1979 random sample drawn was 10%; the 1980 sample was 16%. (All the answered questionnaires were assigned numbers in order of when they were returned; then the 16% of the total population were chosen by the computer.) A larger random sample does not necessarily indicate a better representation of the user population. To improve the sample so that it will be a more accurate representation of the population week, long surveys at different times of the year would have to be conducted. As was done the previous year, the random sample was drawn, utilizing each half-hour time period (including the batch of orphan questionnaires) as a stratum. This stratification procedure gives equiprobability of selection to every half-hour unit and therefore reduces the possibility of sampling error. This is based on the assumption that a weekend morning user, for example, might have certain different measured characteristics (e.g. occupation, place of residence) than the weekday evening user. The absolute numbers for the sample drawn on each day are:

Thursday	336
Saturday	346
Sunday	202
Total =	884

The coding procedure was similar to last year's. (See Appendix II) It was arbitrarily decided that if a user came through the entrance a minute after the half-hour (i.e. 9.01-9.29), the time was coded as 9.30. Therefore the rate of error could be 29 minutes. For Questions G, H, and 'additional comments', it was decided to include 'can't tell' owing to the ambiguous nature of some of the comments. For example, if a user criticized libraries in general, one could not code that remark under favourable, nor is it directly unfavourable, therefore it was placed under 'can't tell'. For Questions C, D (If no and If yes sections), E, and F, more than one answer

could be given. Therefore it should be noted that the percentages for these questions will add up to more than 100%.

Once the sample population was chosen and the data coded and keypunched, the results were tabulated by the computer programme Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Where are they from? Who are they? Why are they coming here?

From a total number of 884 cases, it was found that 62% of the users were students. The 1979 survey showed that 55% of the total population were students. Therefore it appears that 7% more students are using the Metropolitan Toronto Library (see Table 1). Professionals account for 19% of the users, clerks (which include businesspeople) were 6% of the users, and craftsmen 4% (see Table 2). The 'no response' accounted for 5% of the total sample. It may be that many users overlooked Question A because of the smaller-sized box. Subsequent surveys based upon this questionnaire should consider designing the first question so that it becomes more visible. The data indicate that clerks use the Library more on the weekday than at the weekend. Students use the Library over 10% more on the weekend than the weekday. From the total student population, 38% are grade 12 - 13 users, which indicates that there has been no change from the year before (see Table 3). The data reveal that there is an increase in 'other' students using the Library. It is noteworthy that 26% of the students attend private schools (at all levels). Fifty per cent of the community college users are enrolled at Ryerson, 10% attend George Brown, and the remaining 40% attend other community colleges. Full-time students accounted for approximately 74% of the population.

In the 1979 report, it was stated that one of the most outstanding findings is the extent to which the Library attracts users from beyond the municipal boundaries. In 1979 only 52% of the student users indicated that they reside in downtown Toronto. In 1980, the statistics remain at about the same level (52%) (see Table 4). Table 5 breaks down the percentages by student level. There has been a significant change in the number of students from North York who use the Library. From the total 1980 student population, 22 live in North York. In 1979, of the North York student population, 20% of the grades 9 - 11 and 30% of the grades 12 - 13 used Metro; in 1980, however, the proportions became 5% and 10% less respectively. The data also indicate, however, that 11% more North York university students are using the Library. Perhaps more of the North York high school students are finding that the libraries in their own city are getting better at fulfilling their needs. On the other hand, it may be that more university students who reside in North York are discovering that their needs can be fulfilled at Metro. Another interesting change from last year is that 12% fewer university students who reside in Toronto are using the Library. It is difficult to speculate on why this has occurred. Perhaps more downtown university students are deciding to study at their institution's library.

Table 6 shows the reasons for coming to the Library by all users. It is interesting that 2% more users came to the Library to do assignments, and a similar increase is shown for users coming to study. The next table (Table 7) shows that 60% of the total student population come to the Library to do an assignment, a decrease of 4% since last year. This falling off could indicate that it may have taken the students a year to realize that the books required do not circulate. The number of students who came to study at the Library, however, remains the same at 44%. Significant changes in why certain occupations come to the Library are few. Professionals appear to be doing more assignments (8% increase over last year), but they are not as involved in hobby research (6% decrease). It is interesting that 33% of the unemployed users are using the Library for job-related research as opposed to only 20% in 1979. This might suggest that more library users are realizing that the Library has the materials to help them find employment.

Last year's questionnaire asked if another library could have been used for the same purposes. It did not probe, however, why the user came to Metro rather than to another library. The emphasis of last year's analysis was on whether the user opted for Metro or whether the user was without alternative recourse if he was to accomplish his purpose. The 1980 questionnaire was modified in order to find out why a user came to Metro rather than to another library. Therefore the weight of the question was shifted from looking at alternatives that could have been used, to why alternative libraries were not used. From the total 1980 sample population, 59% said that they could not have used another library; 34% said they could have gone elsewhere; 3% specified both yes and no; the remaining 3% did not respond. Two-thirds of the student population indicated that they could not have used another library for the same purposes. The highest percentage of students who could have gone to another library were university students (56%). From the total population, 21% could have used a local public library, 14% could have gone to their school library, 10% could have gone to their institution's library, and 4% indicated elsewhere. The data reveal that 3% and 5% fewer students feel that their school or institution's library respectively is a feasible alternative. When asked for reasons why they could not have used another library for the same purposes, 45% indicated that material was not available elsewhere (see Table 8). It is most interesting that the second most popular reason for coming to Metro rather than elsewhere is that the atmosphere is preferred. Being a reference library, people have to spend time within the complex. It is nice to know that users acknowledge the pleasant atmosphere. It is even more revealing, however, that some users specified that they chose to come to Metro rather than elsewhere because of the atmosphere. If this indicates nothing else, it is a tribute to the architect and designer of the Library!

What departments are they going to? What materials are they using?

Another question that was added to the 1980 questionnaire was 'what department of the library did you use today?' A few problems were encountered with this question. It was brought to the author's attention at the end of the first day (by the Head of the Languages Centre) that several of their

users were indicating that they were using the Audio-Visual Services instead of or as well as the Languages Centre. This is a logical misunderstanding because the Languages Centre has a separate desk for the audio-visual materials. The data confirmed that 17 weekend users specified that they had been in Audio-Visual Services, when in fact this department is closed on the weekend. The author deduced that the 17 users were actually in the audio-visual area of the Languages Centre. The Audio-Visual Services' statistics show that no more than 15 people used their department on the Thursday. According to the random sample of 16%, approximately 1% of the total sample size used this department on Thursday. Also, as noted earlier in this report, not all people using the first floor newspaper area would necessarily be handed a questionnaire. However, according to somebody who works in that department, many users take breaks from other departments in the Newspaper Unit. One factor seems to balance out the other.

From a total population of 884 (see Table 9)(N.B. A user may have gone to more than one department which will account for the higher population number), the most frequented departments were: Science & Technology (19%); Social Sciences (17%); Business (14%); History (12%); Languages (12%); Literature (11%); Fine Art (9%); Music (9%); and General Reference (8%). Table 10 shows the breakdown of the total population by students, professionals and others. The departments which are used by a large number of students are: Literature (78% of users in that department); History (77%); Canadian History (67%); Theatre (66%); Music (64%); and Science & Technology (60%). A very low percentage of students use the Bibliographic Centre (23%), as opposed to 57% professionals. This data may indicate that the majority of students are not aware of the services provided by this department. A significant number of users in the Fine Art Department (36%) and the Business Department (31%) are professionals. In the Science & Technology Department, 24% of the users are also professionals. The statistics in Table 11 show the percentage breakdown and number of students and professionals who use the Library departments. The data indicate that 20% of the student population used the Social Sciences Department; 18% made use of the Science & Technology Department; 16% indicated the History Department; 14% used the Literature Department; 11% frequented the Business Department; and 9% used the Music Department. The data show that 8% of the students and 11% of the professionals used the Languages Centre. These percentages may be off slightly (up to 2%) if these user groups mistakenly specified that they were in Audio-Visual Services instead of, or as well as, the Languages Centre. It is interesting that in several departments (Bibliographic Centre, Business, Fine Art, General Reference, Languages, Music, First Floor Newspaper Unit, and Science & Technology), there is a higher proportion of professionals than students. For example, the statistics show that 16% of the professional population use the Fine Art Department as opposed to only 7% of the student user group.

When asked what kinds of materials were used, 69% specified books, 20% magazines, 14% files, 7% microfilms and microfiches, and 14% indicated other. Out of the total population, 57% specified that they found the materials that they came for, 22% indicated partly, and 21% stated no. The percentage of users who asked for help was 46%. From the percentage of users who did ask for

assistance, 78% were satisfied, 15% were partly satisfied, and 7% were not satisfied. It is felt by the author that the 1979 Tables 13 and 14 are misleading because of incorrect tabulations. Included in the total population were the students who did not request assistance. These users were coded in the 'no response' column. One cannot answer if the help received was satisfactory unless one asked for help. In other words, the variable of satisfaction can only be measured if help was received. In 1980, of the total population who required assistance (N=408), 76% were satisfied, 15% were partially satisfied, 7% were not pleased, and the remaining 2% did not respond. Table 12 shows that fewer high school students asked for help in 1980 than in 1979. However, it is interesting that over 10% more university students demanded assistance this year. Table 13 reveals that the most satisfied user group is the university students, and the least satisfied group is the grade 9 - 11 students. It is difficult to analyse this data. It may indicate that higher level students are more accustomed to the reference interview. In order to find out why certain student levels appear more satisfied than others, interviews would have to be conducted with users from these student groups.

Who FIRST referred you to the library?

When the total population was asked who first referred them to the Library, 50% stated no one, 30% indicated a friend, 8% gave teacher as a referral, and 3% specified parent. At the student level, 50% of the population indicated that no one referred them to the Library. Table 14 shows that the referral trend has not changed significantly over the past year. The most effective means of referral for high school students is the peer group. Teachers do not play a significant role in the referring of students to the Library except for private school teachers. Approximately 36% of private school students are referred by their teachers. It is noteworthy that at least 70% of the private school students reside within the city of Toronto. If their schools do not have adequate resources, it would not be difficult for this group to use Metro's facilities. A private school which maintains high standards might refer its students to Metro because of its research-oriented collection. An interview study (or a questionnaire designed for this special student user) would give a better understanding of why this group of students is being referred to Metro by its teachers.

Additional comments

From the total population (N=884), approximately 9% supplied additional comments. Favourable comments totalled 32, there were 41 unfavourable comments, and 4 were categorized under 'can't tell'. A favourable comments from the sample reads:

> "Excellent facility. Came highly recommended by friends and colleagues. This has been my first (but not my last!) visit. Your staff was extremely helpful - even to the point of making telephone calls to other facilities to check available resources for me. Outstanding!"

The unfavourable comments appear more often, but on the average they do not seem to be as critical as the favourable comments are superlative. Common complaints are: a brusque staff member, early closing hours, too short Sunday hours, noisy students, insufficient study space, no place to buy food in the Library. A further analysis of the comments is recommended.

Conclusions

The purpose of the 1979 survey was to provide data profiling the user. The 1980 survey took this one step further by comparing this year's data with last year's findings. In most instances, the percentages remained basically the same. Ideally this survey will continue to be annually updated. Any prominent patterns and developments would be more significant after five years, for example, than after only one year. This survey concentrated on the student user. The author believes that if a detailed analysis is to be done on the student population, a special questionnaire should be designed for this user group. Or perhaps the interview method would be a more effective means of collecting accurate and informative data. Either of these two methods would provide (1) data which is more representative of this user group, and (2) more detailed data about the student population.

The author hopes that this survey will shed some light on the trends and habits of the 1980 user. It was not possible to supply in this report all the data compiled by the computer package. The computer printouts and the programme deck (in the case that any further crosstabulations are required) are available through Professor Denis at the Faculty of Library Science of the University of Toronto.

TABLE 1

Percentage* breakdown of students as a proportion of library users

	1979	1980
Student	55%	62%
Other occupations	36%	33%
No response	9%	5%
	100%	100%
	(N=507)	(N=884)

*All percentages will be rounded off in this and other tables.

TABLE 2

Breakdown of users by occupation

Occupation	Per cent	Total N=884
Professional	19	171
Clerical	6	57
Craft	4	35
Unemployed	1	6
Housewife	2	16
Retired	1	12
Student	62	545
Other	0.2	2
No response	5	40
	100	884

TABLE 3

Breakdown of student library users by academic level

	1979	1980
Grades 9 - 11	46	90
	(17%)	(15%)
Grades 12 - 13	105	230
	(38%)	(38%)
University	80	156
	(29%)	(26%)
Other students	46	124
	(17%)	(21%)
	N=277	N=600*
	(100%)	(100%)

*545 users gave 'student' as occupation under Question A. However, 600 users indicated a student level under Question J.

TABLE 4

Breakdown of student library users 9 - 13 and university by their place of residence

	1979	1980
East York	8	24
	(3%)	(5%)
Etobicoke	14	33
	(6%)	(7%)
North York	46	80
	(20%)	(17%)
Scarborough	13	41
	(6%)	(9%)
Toronto	119	249
	(52%)	(52%)
York	2	25
	(1%)	(5%)
Ontario	18	17
	(8%)	(4%)
Else or blank	11	7
	(5%)	(2%)
	N=231	N=476
	(100%)	(100%)

TABLE 5

Percentage breakdown of student library users at each level by their place of residence

	Student level					
	9 - 11		12 - 13		university	
	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980
East York	9%	6%	2%	3%	3%	4%
Etobicoke	2%	6%	8%	7%	6%	8%
North York	20%	15%	30%	20%	8%	19%
Scarborough	9%	9%	6%	10%	4%	8%
Toronto	52%	53%	42%	47%	64%	52%
York	2%	4%	1%	8%	Ø%	2%
Ontario	7%	4%	10%	5%	6%	6%
Else or blank	Ø%	2%	3%	1%	10%	Ø%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	N=46	N=47	N=105	N=109	N=80	N=48

TABLE 6

Reasons given for coming to the library by all users

(NOTE: Users could cite more than one reason.)

1979 N=507
1980 N=884

Do an assignment		Study		Job-related research		Hobby research		Meet friends		Other	
1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980
41%	43%	31%	34%	15%	15%	18%	15%	5%	5%	17%	12%

TABLE 7

Reasons given for coming to the library by the user's occupation. Users could cite more than one reason for coming, so column totals may exceed 100%. 1979 N=507; 1980 N=884

	Professional		Clerk		Craftsman		Unemployed		Housewife		Retired		Student		Other		No response	
	1979 N=104	1980 N=171	1979 N=40	1980 N=57	1979 N=20	1980 N=35	1979 N=5	1980 N=6	1979 N=6	1980 N=16	1979 N=7	1980 N=12	1979 N=277	1980 N=545	1979 N=5	1980 N=2	1979 N=43	1980 N=40
Do assignment	2%	10%	18%	7%	25%	7%	Ø%	Ø%	17%	Ø%	Ø%	8%	64%	60%	20%	Ø%	35%	40%
Study	11%	18%	16%	19%	15%	20%	40%	33%	17%	19%	29%	8%	44%	44%	Ø%	Ø%	23%	18%
Job-related research	43%	42%	28%	30%	Ø%	20%	20%	33%	33%	Ø%	Ø%	Ø%	4%	Ø%	20%	40%	12%	23%
Hobby research	26%	20%	33%	30%	40%	37%	20%	50%	17%	50%	57%	33%	10%	8%	20%	50%	23%	20%
Meet friends	2%	4%	5%	5%	25%	9%	Ø%	Ø%	Ø%	6%	Ø%	Ø%	5%	6%	Ø%	Ø%	Ø%	Ø%
Other	25%	21%	30%	23%	25%	26%	60%	50%	50%	31%	44%	42%	9%	5%	40%	Ø%	14%	10%

TABLE 8

If you could not have used another library for the same purposes, why not?

(NOTE: More than one reason could be specified.)

	Per cent	N=884
Material needed not available	45	400
Insufficient study space	12	102
Library hours not convenient	11	94
Staff not helpful	3	22
Location not convenient	12	105
Atmosphere not as good	19	164
Other	4	30
No response	0.4	4
		921

TABLE 9

What department of the library did you use today?

(NOTE: More than one department could be specified.)

	Per cent	N=884
Bibliographic Centre	3	30
Business Department	14	120
Canadian History Department	6	56
Fine Art Department	9	76
General Reference Department	8	74
History Department	12	110
Languages Centre	12	108
Literature Department	11	96
Music Department	9	77
Newspapers - First floor	4	37
Newspapers - Third floor	6	52
Science & Technology	19	169
Social Sciences Department	17	154
Theatre Department	4	32
No response	1	5

TABLE 10

Percentage breakdown of students, professionals, and others who use the departments

(NOTE: More than one department could be cited.)

	Students N=545	Professionals N=171	Other N=168	Total N=884
Bibliographic Centre	23%	57%	20%	100%
Business Department	48%	31%	21%	100%
Canadian History Department	67%	14%	19%	100%
Fine Art Department	50%	36%	14%	100%
General Reference Department	50%	27%	23%	100%
History Department	77%	12%	11%	100%
Languages Centre	51%	20%	29%	100%
Literature Department	78%	12%	10%	100%
Music Department	64%	22%	14%	100%
Newspapers - First floor	41%	35%	24%	100%
Newspapers - Third floor	59%	15%	26%	100%
Science & Technology Dept.	60%	24%	16%	100%
Social Sciences Department	71%	16%	13%	100%
Theatre Department	66%	22%	12%	100%

TABLE 11

Breakdown of students (by total student population) and professionals (by total professional population) who use the library departments

(NOTE: More than one department may be used.)

	Students		Professionals	
	Per cent	N=545	Per cent	N=171
Bibliographic Centre	1%	7	10%	17
Business Department	11%	57	22%	37
Canadian History	7%	37	5%	8
Fine Art Department	7%	38	16%	27
General Reference	7%	37	12%	20
History Department	16%	85	8%	13
Languages Centre*	8%	46	11%	18
Literature Dept.	14%	75	6%	11
Music Department	9%	49	11%	17
Newspapers - First fl.	3%	15	8%	13
Newspapers - Third fl.	5%	29	5%	8
Science & Technology	18%	100	23%	40
Social Sciences Dept.	20%	108	14%	24
Theatre Department	4%	21	4%	7

*Data may be off as much as 2% owing to users mistakenly identifying the Languages Centre audio area as the Audio Visual Services.

TABLE 12

Did you ask for help today?

		9 - 11		12 - 13		University	
		N=46	N=90	N=105	N=230	N=80	N=156
		1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980
Staff help:	Yes	59%	56%	51%	41%	26%	37%
	No	39%	40%	44%	52%	68%	56%
	No response	2%	4%	6%	7%	6%	8%
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 13

If you asked for help today, were you satisfied?

		9 - 11	12 - 13	University
Satisfied:	Yes	62%	71%	83%
	No	12%	9%	4%
	Partly	16%	20%	13%
	No response	10%	Ø%	Ø%
		100%	100%	100%

TABLE 14

Who first referred you to the library?

		9 - 11		12 - 13		University	
		1979 N=49	1980 N=90	1979 N=105	1980 N=230	1979 N=80	1980 N=156
Refer:	No one	23%	33%	34%	31%	61%	58%
	Teacher	7%	9%	19%	17%	5%	3%
	Parent	15%	10%	3%	[illegible]	1%	5%
	Librarian	2%	Ø%	Ø%	4%	1%	3%
	Friend	33%	36%	37%	44%	28%	28%
	Other	15%	12%	5%	4%	4%	2%
	No response	Ø%	1%	2%	1%	Ø%	1%
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

METROPOLITAN TORONTO LIBRARY BOARD
1980 User Survey

APPENDIX I

A. Occupation: _____

B. Place of residence:
- East York ☐
- Etobicoke ☐
- North York ☐
- Scarborough ☐
- Toronto ☐
- York ☐
- Other (specify) ☐

C. Why did you come to the library today?
(check as many as apply)
1. do an assignment ☐
2. study ☐
3. job-related research ☐
4. hobby research ☐
5. meet friends ☐
6. other (specify) ☐

D. Could you have used another library for the same purposes?
1. No ☐ 2. Yes ☐

If no, why not? (check as many as apply)
1. Material needed not available ☐
2. Insufficient study space ☐
3. Library hours not convenient ☐
4. Staff not helpful ☐
5. Location not convenient ☐
6. Atmosphere not as good ☐
7. Other, specify ☐

If yes, what library could you have used?
1. Your local public library? ☐
2. Your school library? ☐
3. Your institution's library? ☐
4. Elsewhere? (specify) ☐

E. What department of the library did you use today? (check as many as apply)
1. Audio visual ☐
2. Bibliographic Centre ☐
3. Business ☐
4. Canadian History ☐
5. Fine Art ☐
6. General Reference ☐
7. History ☐
8. Languages ☐
9. Literature ☐
10. Music ☐
11. Newspapers-First Floor ☐
12. Newspapers-Third Floor ☐
13. Science & Technology ☐
14. Social Sciences ☐
15. Theatre ☐

F. What kinds of materials did you use?
(Check as many as apply)
1. books ☐
2. magazines ☐
3. files ☐
4. microfilms/fiches ☐
5. other, such as phono-records, pictures (specify) ☐

G. If you came for materials did you find what you wanted?
1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Partly ☐
If not, why not?

H. Did you ask the staff for help today?
1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐
If yes, were you satisfied with the help given?
1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Partly ☐
If not, why not?

I. Who FIRST referred you to this library?
1. no one ☐
2. teacher-instructor ☐
3. parent ☐
4. librarian ☐
5. friend ☐
6. other (specify) ☐

J. If you are now a student please check below:
A. part-time ☐
B. full-time ☐

1. up to grade 8 ☐
2. grade 9, 10, or 11 ☐
3. grade 12 or 13 ☐

Independent schools:
4. private school ☐
5. trade school ☐
6. correspondence school ☐

7. Ryerson ☐
8. George Brown ☐
9. other community college ☐
10. university ☐
11. other (specify) ☐

Staff Use Only	
9:00	1
:30	2
10:00	3
:30	4
11:00	5
:30	6
12:00	7
:30	8
1:00	9
:30	10
2:00	11
:30	12
3:00	13
:30	14
4:00	15
:30	16
5:00	17
:30	18
6:00	19
:30	20
7:00	21
:30	22
8:00	23
:30	24
9:00	25

For additional comments use other side

Thank you for completing this Questionnaire
PLEASE LEAVE IT AT THE EXIT GATE

Coding Instructions

	Identification number	0001-1000		C.1-3
	Time entered	01	9 a.m.	C.5,6
		02	9.30 a.m.	
		03	10 a.m.	
			etc. as on survey	
		00	no response	
				C.7 blank
	half-hours stayed	01	1	C.8,9
		02	2	
		03	3	
			etc.	
		00	no response	
				C.10 blank
A.	Occupation	1.	professional	C.11
		2.	clerical	
		3.	craftsman, foreman, operative	
		4.	unemployed	
		5.	housewife	
		6.	retired	
		7.	preschool child	
		8.	student	
		9.	other	
		0.	no response	
				C.12 blank
B.	Residence	1.	East York	C.13
		2.	Etobicoke	
		3.	North York	
		4.	Scarborough	
		5.	Toronto	
		6.	York	
		7.	Other (Ontario)	
		8.	Other	
		9.	no response	
				C.14 blank
C.	Why came to library	1.	assignment	C.15
		2.	study	C.16
		3.	job research	C.17
		4.	hobby research	C.18
		5.	meet friends	C.19
		6.	other	C.20
		0.	no response	C.21
				C.22 blank

D.	Use library for the same purposes	1.	no	C.23
		2.	yes	
		3.	yes and no	
		4.	maybe	
		0.	no response	
				C.24 blank
	if no, why not?	1.	material	C.25
		2.	study space	C.26
		3.	library hours	C.27
		4.	staff	C.28
		5.	location	C.29
		6.	atmosphere	C.30
		7.	other	C.31
		0.	no response	C.32
				C.33 blank
	if yes, what library?	1.	public	C.34
		2.	school	C.35
		3.	institution	C.36
		4.	elsewhere	C.37
		0.	no response	C.38
				C.39 blank
E.	What department did you use	1.	Audio visual	C.40
		2.	Bibliographic Centre	C.41
		3.	Business	C.42
		4.	Canadian History	C.43
		5.	Fine Art	C.44
		6.	General Reference	C.45
		7.	History	C.46
		8.	Languages	C.47
		9.	Literature	C.48
		10.	Music	C.49
		11.	Newspapers - First Fl.	C.50
		12.	Newspapers - Third Fl.	C.51
		13.	Science & Technology	C.52
		14.	Social Sciences	C.53
		15.	Theatre	C.54
		00.	no response	C.55
				C.56 blank
F.	Kinds of materials used	1.	books	C.57
		2.	magazines	C.58
		3.	files	C.59
		4.	microfilms/fiches	C.60
		5.	other	C.61
		0.	no response	C.62
				C.63 blank

G.	Find materials	1.	yes	C.64
		2.	no	
		3.	partly	
		0.	no response	
	comments	1.	favourable	C.65
		2.	unfavourable	
		3.	can't tell	
		0.	no response	
				C.66 blank
H.	Asked staff for help	1.	yes	C.67
		2.	no	
		0.	no response	
	satisfied	1.	yes	C.68
		2.	no	
		3.	partly	
		0.	no response	
	comments	1.	favourable	C.69
		2.	unfavourable	
		3.	can't tell	
		4.	no need	
		0.	no response	
				C.70 blank
I.	Who referred you	1.	no one	C.71
		2.	teacher-instructor	
		3.	parent	
		4.	librarian	
		5.	friend	
		6.	other	
		0.	no response	
				C.72 blank
J.	Student status	1.	full-time	C.73
		2.	part-time	
		3.	no response	
				C.74 blank
	school level	01.	K - 8	C.75,76
		02.	9 - 11	
		03.	12 - 13	
		04.	private	
		05.	trade	
		06.	correspondence	
		07.	Ryerson	
		08.	George Brown	
		09.	other community	
		10.	university	
		11.	other	
		00.	no response	
				C.77 blank

Additional comments	1.	favourable	C.78
	2.	unfavourable	
	3.	can't tell	
	0.	no response	
			C.79 blank
Day	1.	Thursday	C.80
	2.	Saturday	
	3.	Sunday	